

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested. Claims 12, 14-21, 33-35 and 39 have been canceled. Claims 1-3, 10-11, 22, 26-27, and 37 have been amended without adding new matter. The remarks below, in response to claim rejections, refer to the claims as amended herein. Claims 1-11, 13, 22-32, and 36-38 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 1-6, 9, 10, 12-30, and 32-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Barkan, U.S. Patent No. 5,536,930 (“Barkan”).

As to claim 1, Applicant submits that Barkan does not disclose or suggest the following features:

a first module contained in the first housing segment, wherein the first module includes one or more user-interface features provided with the first housing segment;
a second module contained in the second housing segment, wherein the second module includes one or more user-interface features provided with the second housing segment for use with the second module and not the first module; and
wherein the one or more user-interface features of each of the first module and the second module includes at least one component to provide output to a user and one component to enable the user to enter input

Barkan does not teach the use of two modules, let alone two modules provided with different housing segments. Applicant directs the Examiner to the specification, which recites that a module, by definition, includes “one or more user-interface features.” (See specification, page 5, third paragraph). With this definition, Barkan does not teach multiple modules, because not all the functionality cited in the teachings of modules qualify as a “module”. For example, the optical reader/scanner of Barkan is not a module, because it has no user-interface features.

However, even if the optical reader/scanner of Barkan could be considered as a module (as defined in the specification), the amended claims recite the additional language of the user-interface features of each module including “at least one component to provide output to a user and one component to enable the user to enter input.” The optical reader or scanner disclosed in Barkan does not include this feature, as the optical scanner/reader does not have any output, other than the display which is shared by the other module. Note claim 1 also recites “wherein the second module includes one or more user-interface features provided with the second housing segment for use with the second module and not the first module,” to clearly separate the two modules.

Because Barkan lacks at least the above-recited combination, Barkan does not anticipate claim 1 nor claims 2-11, 13 and 32 which depend from and further limit claim 1. Applicant notes further that claim 2 recites selective operation of one module over another, and claim 3 recites use of separate exterior surfaces from which the user-interfaces of the different modules are provided. None of these limitations are in any way taught by Barkin.

Claim 22 recites in part:

- a first module having a combination of logic and one or more user-interface features;
- a second module having a combination of logic and one or more user-interface features coupled to the first module; and
- wherein the one or more user-interface features of each of the first module and the second module includes at least one component to provide output to a user and one component to enable the user to enter input

Even though Barkan discloses a touch sensitive display coupled to an optical scanning device, as noted above, Applicant submits that the scanner disclosed in Barkan is not a module having one or more user-interface features. Furthermore, even if the scanner disclosed in Barkan could arguably be found to be a module with user-interface features similar to that of Applicant's

claim 22, the scanner's user-interface features do not include at least one component to provide output to a user and one component to enable the user to enter input.

Because Barkan does not disclose or suggest the above-recited limitations Barkan does not anticipate claim 22 nor claims 23-25 and 36-37 which depend from and further limit claim 22.

With regard to independent Claim 26, it recites in part:

wherein each of the first set and second set of user-interface features includes at least one component to provide output to a user and one component to enable the user to enter input

The arguments presented above with respect are applicable to this independent claim as well. Moreover, the user-interface features (i.e., emitter/receiver window) of the scanner disclosed in Barkan does not include at least one component to provide output to a user and one component to enable the user to enter input.

Because Barkan does not disclose or suggest the above-recited limitations Barkan does not anticipate claim 26 nor claims 27-30 and 38 which depend from and further limit claim 26.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 7, 8, 11 and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barkan in view of Clapper, U.S. Patent No. 6,704, 007 ("Clapper").

Claims 7, 8, 11, and 31 depend from claim 1 and thus include the limitations:

a first module contained in the first housing segment, wherein the first module includes one or more user-interface features provided with the first housing segment for use with the first module;
a second module contained in the second housing segment, wherein the second module includes one or more user-interface features provided with the second housing

segment for use with the second module and not the first module; and

wherein the one or more user-interface features of each of the first module and the second module includes at least one component to provide output to a user and one component to enable the user to enter input

As discussed above, Barkan does not disclose the above recited limitations and applicant submits that Clapper does not disclose the limitations. For reasons stated above, the combination of references would not teach all the limitations of independent Claim 1, and thus no prima facie case for obviousness can be made from these two references alone.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. If a telephone interview would be helpful in any way, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Applicant has included a petition for a two month extension of time and authorization is hereby given to charge deposit account 501914 for any fee deficiency associated with this submission.

Respectfully submitted,

SHEMWELL MAHAMEDI LLP



Van Mahamedi, Reg. No. 42,828
Tel. 408-236-6640

Date May 22, 2006